

MEASURE CONVOLUTION SEMIGROUPS AND NON-INFINITELY DIVISIBLE PROBABILITY DISTRIBUTIONS.

Aubrey Wulfsohn

Mathematics Institute, University of Warwick, Coventry, CV4 7AL, UK
awu@maths.warwick.ac.uk

Keywords: Probability distributions, Poisson processes, Lévy processes, infinitely divisible, random variables, convolution semigroups, log-convex sequence, Stieltjes moment sequence, totally positive matrices, combinatorics, random measures, continuous products, Boolean convolution, statistical mechanics.

AMS 2000 subject classification: 60E10, 60E07, 05A05 (Primary) 46L51, 46N50, 82B10 (Secondary)

Abstract

Let μ be a probability measure (or corresponding random variable) such that all moments μ_n exist. Knowledge of the moments is not sufficient to determine infinite divisibility of the measure; we show also that infinitely divisible, and in particular lognormal, distributions lose infinite divisibility when censored in certain ways even if all moments are arbitrarily close to those of the uncensored distribution. The moments of a composition of k copies of μ are expressed as combinatorial compositions of the μ_n . We express the moments of the compositions in the context of occupancy problems, arranging n balls in k cells; the classical convolution is described by Maxwell-Boltzmann statistics and is multinomial. For certain non-infinitely divisible measures with moments increasing fast enough the indexing of a k -cell combinatorial composition is extended to indexing by non-negative real t and we construct classical convolution measure semigroups from amongst the t -indexed classes. We prove also that when a random variable with infinitely divisible distribution is embedded in a Lévy process (Y_t) then the t -indexed Maxwell-Boltzmann is the law of Y_t . In order to get moment-based multinomial compositions indexed by a continuum we use random measures and random distributions rather than random variables. An alternative approach to embeddability of a non-infinitely divisible μ is by considering non-classical convolution measure semigroups; for example embedding μ in a Boolean convolution measure semigroup and retaining the multinomial character of the moments. Embedding μ in an Urbanik generalised convolution measure semigroup one loses the multinomial character of the moments.

1 Semigroups and non-infinitely divisible distributions

1.1 Moments of censored lognormal distributions

The (α, σ) -lognormal distribution $X_{\alpha, \sigma}$ has probability density $\frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi\sigma^2}y} \exp\{\frac{-(\log y - \alpha)^2}{2\sigma^2}\}$, support $\mathbf{R}_+$ and is known to be infinitely divisible with moments $\mu_n = e^{n\alpha + \frac{1}{2}n^2\sigma^2}$. A third parameter could describe shift of the support along $\mathbf{R}$. There is no moment generating function since the moment expansion of the characteristic function does not converge at all. The characteristic function is known ([30]) and the density function for its Lévy measure can be expressed as $\int_0^\infty e^{-x\xi} U(\xi) d\xi$ ([31]), but U cannot be explicitly determined.

For a real random variable X the *spectrum* $\sigma(X)$ of X is taken to be the set of all points of increase of its distribution function. It is well-known that the spectrum of an infinitely divisible distribution μ is the closure of vector sum of n copies of the spectrum of $\mu^{\frac{1}{n}}$, for every $n \in \mathbf{N}$.

For any lognormal distribution one can produce a discrete distribution with the same moments which is not infinitely divisible. Indeed, it is shown in [15] that the discrete distribution with weights $a^{-n}e^{-\frac{1}{2}n^2\sigma^2}$ at the points $ae^{n\sigma^2}$, $n \in \mathbf{Z}$ has the same moments as a lognormal distribution; the parameter a is dependent on α . This distribution is not infinitely divisible; indeed, the spectrum of μ cannot be the vector sum of n copies of $\mu^{\frac{1}{n}}$, for any $n > 1$.

We shall generalise the following:

Proposition 1.1. *If X is a Poisson random variable then $\mathbf{P}[X \in (a, b)] > 0$ implies that $\mathbf{P}[X \in (na, nb)] > 0$ {and also that $\sigma(X) \cap (a, b) \neq \emptyset$ implies $\sigma(X) \cap (na, nb) \neq \emptyset$ } for all $n \geq 1$.*

Proof. Obvious since $\mathbf{P}[X = n] = e^{-\lambda}\lambda^n/n!$ for some $\lambda > 0$. □

Definition 1.2. *The left-truncated lognormal is constructed by truncating the mass over an interval $(0, b)$, $b > 0$ and transferring the removed mass to the origin. The right truncated lognormal is constructed by truncating the interval $[c, +\infty)$ for some $c > 0$ and redistributing the removed mass over $[0, c)$. The gap-censored lognormal is constructed by cutting off the mass over the interval (a, b) , $0 < a < b$, and transferring that mass to the origin.*

Proposition 1.3. *Right-truncated lognormal distributions are not infinitely divisible.*

Proof. They cannot be infinitely divisible as they have finite support ([17] §8.4). □

Definition 1.4. *For a measure μ on $\mathbf{R}_+$ for which all the moments are finite we call $C = \limsup_n \frac{\mu_n^2}{\mu_{n-1}\mu_{n+1}}$ the critical ratio for the moment sequence of μ .*

In Proposition 4.15 the critical ratio is shown to provide a criterion for indeterminacy of the moment sequence (μ_n) . We show that censored lognormals can produce non-infinitely divisible distributions with the same critical ratio as a lognormal.

Proposition 1.5. *For large n , by choosing small enough $b > 0$ the moment $\tilde{m}_n$ for the left-truncated lognormal distribution can be arbitrarily close to the untruncated m_n and the critical value $\tilde{C}$ for the truncated moments will be arbitrarily close to C . The same is true for gap-censored lognormal distributions.*

Proof. For the purposes of the Proposition there is no loss of generality in assuming $\alpha = 0, \sigma = 1$. Denote $\int_x^\infty e^{-\frac{1}{2}u^2} du$ by $\Psi(x)$. Using [19] one sees that $\frac{\tilde{m}_n}{m_n} = \Psi(\log b - n)/\Psi(\log b)$. Thus $\frac{\tilde{m}_n}{m_n}$ is, for small enough b , arbitrarily close to 1 and $\frac{\tilde{m}_n}{\tilde{m}_{n+1}}$ converges uniformly to 1 as $n \rightarrow +\infty$, so $\lim_{b \rightarrow 0} \limsup_n \frac{\tilde{m}_n^2}{\tilde{m}_{n-1}\tilde{m}_{n+1}} = \limsup_n \frac{m_n^2}{m_{n-1}m_{n+1}}$. The Proposition follows. $\square$

Definition 1.6. *We call a Poisson distribution with a random intensity mixed Poisson and we denote the mixed Poisson with intensity X by $\tilde{X}$.*

It is well-known that $\tilde{X}$ is infinitely divisible if X is infinitely divisible.

An infinitely divisible random variable X on $\mathbf{N}_0$ has spectrum in $\mathbf{N}$ and probability generating function $\sum p_n z^n = e^{-\lambda(1-Q(z))}$ where $p_n = \mathbf{P}[X = n]$ and $\lambda Q(z)$ is also a probability generating function, written as $\sum_0^\infty r_k z^k$ with $r_k \geq 0$ for all k .

Definition 1.7. *Katti's test [14] on a discrete distribution on $\mathbf{N}_0$ comprises solving the equations $(n+1)p_{n+1} = \sum_{k=0}^j p_{j-k}r_k, j \in \mathbf{N}_0$ for the given p_n ; a negative r_k implies that the distribution is not infinitely divisible. Conversely, the distribution is infinitely divisible if all the r_k are non-negative.*

Proposition 1.8. *The left-truncated lognormal distribution is not always infinitely divisible; in particular it is not infinitely divisible when $\alpha = 0, \sigma = 1, b = -1.4$.*

Proof. We do this by showing that for the truncated distribution X the discrete distribution $\tilde{X}$ is not infinitely divisible. Consider a Poisson distribution with a truncated lognormal intensity, so the probability generating function is determined by the $p_k = \frac{1}{k!\sqrt{2\pi}} \int_{\log b}^\infty e^{kx - e^x - \frac{x^2}{2}} dx$, and the truncated mass $\frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \int_{-\infty}^{-1.4} e^{-\frac{1}{2}x^2} dx$ is added to p_0 . Applying Katti's test we obtain negative values of r_k for sufficiently large k .

It was more economical for computation to use N copies of the truncated log-normal setting $p_k = \frac{N^k}{k!\sqrt{2\pi}} \int_{\log b}^\infty e^{kx - Ne^x - \frac{x^2}{2}} dx$. Independent computations on Maple and Mathematica, for an accuracy of 16 digits and $N = 10$, produced negative r_8 and r_9 . $\square$

Katti's idea was extended, in [20], to develop a general criterion for infinite divisibility of a distribution on the half-line. We use this to prove:

Theorem 1.9. *The general left-truncated $X_{\alpha,\sigma}$ is not infinitely divisible.*

Proof. A probability measure μ with support in $\mathbf{R}_+$ is not infinitely divisible if for some $x > 0$

$$\int_{[0,x]} y d\mu(y) = \int_{(0,x]} \mu([0, x-y]) y d\nu(y) + \gamma \mu([0, x])$$

for all $\gamma \geq 0$ and all measures ν such that $\int_{(0,+\infty)} \min(1, x) d\nu(x) < +\infty$ ([20] Theorem 51.1). Choosing $x < b$ then the left hand side of the equation is zero

whilst the right hand side is non-zero. Indeed, $\mu[0, x] = \mu([0, x - y])$ is the mass which had been transferred from the truncated section to the origin, so $\gamma\mu([0, x]) > 0$ and also $\int_{(0, x]} y d\nu(y) > 0$. $\square$

Remark 1.10. *Another method of proving non-infinite divisibility of distributions on the half-line is by determining the thickness of the tail. For example, truncate the left half of the Gaussian distribution on $\mathbf{R}$; by adjusting the mass by moving the truncated mass, say to the origin, or by redistributing the left-hand-side mass over the right-hand-side. The tail remains asymptotically the same as before adjustment and so will be too thin for the distribution to be an infintely divisible (see Theorem 26.1 of [20]).*

Definition 1.11. *We define a compound Poisson process to be of the form $X(t) = \sum_1^{N(t)} Y_j$ where the Y_j are i.i.d. non-negative random variables representing the length of jumps taking place at the epochs of a homogeneous Poisson process N , and $N(t)$ represents the number of epochs which have taken place by time t . In the literature the distribution has also been referred to as being completely random or as a mixed or generalised Poisson distribution.*

The characteristic function is known to be of the form $\Phi_X(t) = \exp\{\int (e^{ix\theta} - 1)d\nu(x)\}$ where its Lévy measure ν satisfies $\int \min(1, x)d\nu(x) < \infty$. The usual correction term in the expression is unnecessary since the integral converges without it.

It is well-known that a distribution on $\mathbf{R}_+$ with an atom at 0 is infinitely divisible if and only if it is compound Poisson.

We shall usually interpret X as the distribution for $X(1)$.

Corollary 1.12. *If the jumps of a compound Poisson distribution X are Poisson-distributed random variables its Lévy measure is discrete, and $\mathbf{P}[X \in (a, b)] > 0$ implies that $\mathbf{P}[X \in (na, nb)] > 0$ for all $n \geq 1$*

Proof. This is a direct consequence of Proposition 1.1. $\square$

Definition 1.13. *For $X(t)$ be a compound Poisson process with Lévy measure ν and $\epsilon > 0$ we define X_ϵ to be the restriction of X to jumps of length exceeding ϵ .*

Proposition 1.14. *$\Phi_{X_\epsilon}(t)$ has the form $\exp\{t \int_\epsilon^\infty (e^{i\theta x} - 1)d\nu(x)\}$.*

Proof. Partition $(\epsilon, +\infty)$ as $\bigcup_{j=1}^n B_j$ where the B_j are disjoint Borel sets. Define $X(B_k, t)$ to be $\sum_{\tau \in \sigma(X)} \chi_{B_k}(X(\tau) - X(\tau-))$, viz., the sum of the jumps of size in B_k up to time t . For fixed t the $X(B_k, t)$ are mutually independent and have characteristic functionals of the form $\exp\{t \int_{B_k} (e^{i\theta x} - 1)d\nu(x)\}$. The Proposition follows. $\square$

Lemma 1.15. *$\mathbf{P}[|X - X_\epsilon| > \eta > 0]$ converges to 0 as $\epsilon \rightarrow 0+$.*

Proof. Since $\Phi_{X_\epsilon} \rightarrow \Phi_X$ as $\epsilon \rightarrow 0+$, by a standard argument $|X - X_\epsilon| \rightarrow 0$ in probability. $\square$

Definition 1.16. *A random process Z on (a product of complete separable metric spaces) $\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}$ is called a marked point process if, for any Borel set B in $\mathcal{Y}$ (the space of 'marks'), the number of points in the marginal process $\hat{Z}(B)$ is finite.*

We shall show that X_ϵ is a marked point process, the marks given by independent heights of the jumps. We need the following:

If $\epsilon' < \epsilon$ then $\sigma(X_\epsilon) \subset \sigma(X_{\epsilon'})$ and the mass at any point of $\sigma(X_{\epsilon'})$ is larger than the mass at $\sigma(X_\epsilon)$. By Lemma 1.15, for small enough $\epsilon > 0$ one has $[\sigma(X_\epsilon) \cap (a, b)] \subset [\sigma(X) \cap (a, b)]$ and the mass at any point of $\sigma(X_{\epsilon'})$ remains finite.

Proposition 1.17. *Suppose X is compound Poisson with Lévy measure ν and choose $\epsilon > 0$. Let N_ϵ be a Poisson random variable with intensity $\nu([\epsilon, +\infty))$. Let ν_ϵ denote the restriction of ν to $[\epsilon, +\infty)$. Marks are given by mutually independent heights $(h_j), \{j = 1, \dots, N_\epsilon\}$, the jumps with distribution $\frac{\nu_\epsilon}{\nu([\epsilon, +\infty))}$. Then X_ϵ is equal in law to $\sum_{j=1}^{N_\epsilon} h_j$.*

Lemma 1.18. *Let (a, b) be a bounded interval in $(0, +\infty)$. If*

$\mathbf{P}[X_\epsilon \in (a, b)] \geq 0$ then for any integer $n \geq 1$ there is an arbitrarily small $\eta > 0$ such that also $\mathbf{P}[X_\epsilon \in (n(a - \eta), n(b + \eta))] \geq 0$.

Proof. There is a finite set J_1 of integers j such that $\mathbf{P}[\sum_{j \in J_1} h_j \in A] > 0$. Fixing n , since the underlying process is Poisson, for every $h_j : j \in J_1$ there are also n different jumps with heights h_k arbitrarily close to h_j ; we denote these heights by $h_j, j \in J_\beta, \beta = 2, 3, \dots, n$. Thus there will be an arbitrarily small $\eta > 0$ such that $\mathbf{P}[\sum_{j \in J_1 \cup \dots \cup J_n} h_j \in (na - n\eta, nb + n\eta)] > 0$. $\square$

Theorem 1.19. *Suppose $0 < a < b$ and X compound Poisson. Then $\mathbf{P}[X \in (a, b)] > 0$ implies that $\mathbf{P}[X \in (na, nb)] > 0$ for any integer $n \geq 1$.*

Proof. Choose $\eta > 0$. If $\mathbf{P}[X \in (a, b)] > 0$ then $\mathbf{P}[X_\epsilon \in (a - \eta, b + \eta)] > 0$ for small enough ϵ . By Lemma 1.8 one has $\mathbf{P}[X_\epsilon \in (n(a - \eta), n(b + \eta))] > 0$. Since $X - X_\epsilon$ and X_ϵ are mutually independent, using Corollary 1.12 and Lemma 1.18, $\mathbf{P}[X \in (n(a - \eta), n(b + \eta))] \geq \mathbf{P}[X_\epsilon \in (n(a - \eta), n(b + \eta))] \times \mathbf{P}[|X_\epsilon - X| < \eta] > 0$. Letting $\eta \rightarrow 0+$ the Theorem follows. $\square$

Corollary 1.20. *Gap-censored compound Poisson distributions are not infinitely divisible.*

Proof. Suppose there is a single gap between a and b . If $2a < b$ then the interval $(a, 2a)$ supports mass, a contradiction. If $2a > b$ then the interval $(b, 2a)$ supports mass, if $2a = b$ then the interval $(a/2, a)$ supports mass and again there are contradictions. $\square$

1.2 Combinatorial compositions and their convolution semigroups

The convolution product of copies of a measure gives rise to a discrete convolution semigroup over $\mathbf{N}_0$. We show that we cannot embed the measure in a classical convolution semigroup over $\mathbf{R}_+$.

The n 'th moment of a convolution product of copies of a probability measure is represented by $\mathbf{E}[(\sum_{i=1}^k X_i)^n]$ where the X_i are independent identically distributed real random variables with distribution μ . We admit non-classical interpretations of $(\sum_{i=1}^k X_i)^n$.

Definition 1.21. *For probability measures such that all moments exist, $\mu \circ \nu$ defines the class of measures having n 'th moment $\sum_{j=0}^n C_j^n \mu_j \nu_{n-j}$. We call this the binomial composition of μ and ν . It need not define a unique measure. We extend this idea to*

various combinatorial composition classes of k copies of μ (not necessarily determining a unique measure), written say as $\mu^{\circ k}$. We denote the classical convolution of k copies of μ by μ^k . We express

$(x_1 + \dots + x_k)^n$ as $\sum_{n_1 + \dots + n_k = n} (n; n_1, \dots, n_k) x_1^{n_1} \dots x_k^{n_k}$ where $(n; n_1, \dots, n_k)$ denotes the number of ways of arranging n objects, say balls or particles, into k cells such that there are n_j balls in the j 'th cell. The combinatorial composition is called **multinomial** if

$$(n; n_1, \dots, n_q) = \frac{n!}{n_1! \dots n_q!}$$

Definition 1.22. A sequence of positive real numbers is called *Stieltjes* if it is the moment sequence of some μ with support in $\mathbf{R}_+$, and *Stieltjes determinate* if this measure is uniquely defined by the sequence.

Theorem 1.23. Suppose there is a combinatorial composition $\mu^{\circ k}$, $k \in \mathbf{N}$ of copies of μ which can be extended to be indexed by $t \in \mathbf{R}_+$ in such a way that for each t the sequence $\mu_n^{\circ t}$ is a Stieltjes moment sequence, continuous at t for each n . Then there is a (classical) convolution measure semigroup $\Lambda(t)$ such that $\Lambda(t)$ has the same moments as $\mu^{\circ t}$, though $\Lambda(1) \neq \mu$ when μ is not infinitely divisible.

Proof. There is no loss of generality in assuming $t \in (0, 1)$. For a fixed t , since $\mu_n^{\circ t}$ is, by hypothesis, a Stieltjes moment sequence, there exists a measure, which we denote by $\lambda(t)$, with moment sequence $\mu_n^{\circ t}$. If the moment-sequence is determinate then $\lambda(t) = \mu$. The theorem follows from the following lemmas and the fact that if μ is not infinitely divisible it is not stable and so not embeddable in the semi-group. $\square$

Lemma 1.24. Fix $t \in \mathbf{R}_+$ and denote the integral part of nt by $[nt]$. Given a sequence of measures $(\lambda(\frac{1}{n})^{[nt]})$ there is a subsequence $(n_k^{(t)})$ of $\mathbf{N}$ such that the $\lambda(\frac{1}{n_k^{(t)}})^{[n_k^{(t)}t]}$ converges weakly to a measure, say $\Lambda(t)$, with the same moments as $\mu^{\circ t}$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$.

Proof. This is standard, using Prokhorov's Theorem and the Chebyshev inequality. $\square$

Lemma 1.25. The $\Lambda(t)$, $t \in \mathbf{R}_+$ form a semigroup.

Proof. In order to introduce sufficiently many subsequences of sequences of integers for all $s, t \in \mathbf{R}_+$ we start with s and t rational. Then

$$\lim_k \lambda\left(\frac{1}{n_k}\right)^{[n_k s]} * \lim_k \lambda\left(\frac{1}{n_k}\right)^{[n_k t]} * (\delta_{(1/n_k)})^\rho$$

converges to $\Lambda(s) * \Lambda(t)$ for some subsequence n_k of the sequences $(n_k^{(s)})$ and $(n_k^{(t)})$. The factor $(\delta_{(1/n_k)})^\rho$, where ρ can be 1 or 0, is there to adjust the expression whenever $nt \neq [nt]$. By hypothesis $\mu_k^{\circ t}$ is continuous in a neighbourhood of t so $\Lambda(t) * \Lambda(s) = \Lambda(s + t)$ also for $s, t \in \mathbf{R}_+$. $\square$

Remark 1.26. If μ is not infinitely divisible and the sequence (μ_n) is determinate then for any combinatorial composition the $\mu^{\circ t}$ cannot be a Stieltjes moment sequence for all $t \in \mathbf{R}^+$. It was shown in [1] that the Maxwell-Boltzmann $(\mu_n^{\circ t})$, as defined the next section, form Stieltjes moment sequences if all the $\frac{\mu_n^2}{\mu_{n-1}\mu_{n+1}}$ are all smaller than about $\frac{1}{6}$.

2 Combinatorial convolution semigroups

2.1 Maxwell-Boltzmann statistics

We investigate combinatorial convolutions interpreting the n 'th moment of combinatorial convolutions $\mu^{\circ k}$ as weighted combinations of the arrangements of n balls into k cells so that $q = 0, 1, \dots$ of these are empty. To determine the weights one needs some kind of statistics; there is no non-probabilistic formulation. Differences arise if one distinguishes, or not, between the various particles labelled $x_1, x_2, \dots$ and/or distinguishes, or not, between the cells (say by selecting their order).

Consider a mechanical system of n balls and k cells such that each ball is assigned to a cell. A *state* of the entire system is described by a random distribution of the particles in the cells. We can distinguish between different phase-spaces, for example, with Maxwell-Boltzmann, Bose-Einstein or Fermi-Dirac statistics (see §3). To apply the above to moments of measures we identify a cell with a measure μ , and q balls in μ is represented as μ_q .

There k^n possible ways of distributing n distinguishable balls in k distinguishable cells. For the Maxwell-Boltzmann model, originally proposed to explain the distribution of sub-atomic particles into different energy states, both the balls and the cells are distinguishable and there are $\frac{n!}{n_1! \dots n_k!}$ states; given cells numbered $1, \dots, k$ and allowing multiple occupation and empty cells this is the number of arrangements such that n_j balls are in the j 'th cell. Each of these states has the same probability of occurring i.e., k^{-n} .

Definition 2.1. $\mathfrak{B}_k^n = \sum_{j=0}^{k-1} (-1)^j C_j^k (k-j)^n$, zero for $n > k > 0$. See [9] II §11. We shall call these Boltzmann numbers.

There are $\mathfrak{B}_k^n$ distributions leaving no cells empty and the number of distributions leaving q cells empty is $C_q^k \mathfrak{B}_{k-q}^n$. So also $C_{k-j}^k \mathfrak{B}_j^n$ is the number of distributions with only j cells occupied.

Other characterisations of $\mathfrak{B}$.

$\mathfrak{B}_j^n = \sum_{n_1=1}^n \dots \sum_{n_j=1}^n \chi_{(n_1+\dots+n_j=n)} \frac{n!}{n_1! \dots n_j!}$, where χ signifies the characteristic function of a set (cf. [13] §61).

$\mathfrak{B}_j^n = j! \mathfrak{S}_j^n$ where $\mathfrak{S}_j^n$ denotes the Stirling subset number (i.e., the number of ways of partitioning n objects in j non-empty sets, identical to the Stirling number of the second kind).

$\mathfrak{B}_j^n = \Delta^j x^n|_{x=0}$, where Δ^j represents the j 'th power of the finite difference operator (cf. [17] §2.3).

Definition 2.2. Given μ , and $k \in \mathbb{N}$, we define the Maxwell-Boltzmann $\mu_n^{\circ k}$ as

$$\sum_{j=1}^k C_j^k \sum_{n_1=1}^n \dots \sum_{n_j=1}^n \chi_{(n_1+\dots+n_j=n)} \frac{n!}{n_1! \dots n_j!} \prod_{i=1}^j \mu_{n_i}$$

For t not an integer C_j^t denotes the usual extension of C_j^n for the expansion of $(1+x)^t$.

Since $C_j^k = 0$ when $j > k$ we can define the Maxwell-Boltzmann μ_n^{ot} as

$$\sum_{j=1}^n C_j^t \sum_{n_1=1}^n \cdots \sum_{n_j=1}^n \chi_{(n_1+\cdots+n_j=n)} \frac{n!}{n_1! \cdots n_j!} \prod_{i=1}^j \mu_{n_i}$$

Proposition 2.3. *The Maxwell-Boltzmann arrangement is multinomial.*

Proof. For $k \in \mathbf{N}$ the Maxwell-Boltzmann- μ_n^{ot} is indeed

$$\sum_{n_1+\cdots+n_k=n} \frac{n!}{n_1! \cdots n_k!} \prod_{i=1}^k \mu_{n_i}$$

as the expression in the definition is only a re-arrangement of the terms in this sum. $\square$

The moments are well-defined, involving finite sums of finite products of moments independent of t . The above definition can be confusing for computations. Seeing that the $\mathfrak{S}_k^n$ are well tabulated it is more convenient to compute μ_n^{ot} as the polynomial

$$\sum_{j=1}^n C_j^t \mathfrak{B}_j^n \sum_{n_j=1}^n \chi_{(n_1+\cdots+n_j=n)} \prod_{i=1}^j \mu_{n_i}$$

We elaborate on this in §4. Note that $\mathfrak{B}_1^n = 1$ and $\mathfrak{B}_n^n = n!$ for all n and $\mathfrak{B}_k^n = 0$ for $k > n$.

Infinitely divisible distributions.

Since we are considering positive random variables, in order to simplify notation we shall occasionally use the (possibly formal) moment generating function instead of the characteristic function. Assuming all moments of μ are finite, the cumulant generating function $\theta \mapsto \Psi(\theta)$, i.e., the log of the moment generating function, can be expanded as the infinite series

$\kappa_1\theta + \frac{\kappa_2}{2!}(\theta)^2 + \cdots$ where κ_i is the i 'th cumulant, viz. $\frac{\Psi(0)^{(i)}}{i!}$. One compares this expansion with the infinite series obtained by expanding the characteristic function into powers of θ ; by using de Faa's formula for derivatives of a functional one obtains expressions for the μ_n in as polynomials in $(\kappa_1, \cdots \kappa_n)$ (see [17] §2.4).

Definition 2.4. *Let Y be a real random variable with infinitely divisible distribution μ . We may assume that the characteristic function of Y is of the form $\exp\{i\theta a + \int_0^\infty (e^{i\theta z} - 1)d\nu(z)\}$. For $t \in \mathbf{R}_+$ let Y_t denote the random variable with characteristic function $\exp\{t[i\theta a + \int_0^\infty (e^{i\theta z} - 1)d\nu(z)]\}$.*

The characteristic function of an infinitely divisible μ is of the form $e^{\Psi(\theta)}$, so simplifying de Faa's expansion. One can show, using Taylor and McLaurin expansions around $\theta = 0$, that

$$\left. \frac{d^n}{d\theta^n} \right|_{\theta=0} (e^{\Psi(\theta)}) = n! \sum_{n_1+\cdots+kn_k=n} (\Psi(0)^{(n_1)} \cdots \Psi(0)^{(kn_k)})$$

giving an expression of moments in terms of cumulants. The cumulant generating functional for Y_t is thus

$$t(\kappa_1\theta + \frac{\kappa_2}{2!}(\theta)^2 + \cdots)$$

and the moments thus obtained are polynomials in t with coefficients polynomials in the κ_i .

Theorem 2.5. *For infinitely divisible Y with distribution μ the classical Maxwell-Boltzmann- $\mu^{\circ t}$ is the law of the Lévy process Y_t .*

Proof. The replacement of the symbol k by t in the Maxwell-Boltzmann $\mu^{\circ k}$ and the insertion of the multiplier t before the cumulant generating function of Y to get the cumulant generating function of Y_t are essentially trivial. Both $\mu_n^{\circ t}$ and $\mathbf{E}[(Y_t)^n]$ are polynomials in t vanishing at integer values of t , and as such are identical. $\square$

Illustration.

The simplest example is that of a Poisson random variable Y with distribution μ and mean λ . All the cumulants equal λ . Using the difference-operator formulation of $\mathfrak{B}$ one can show that $\mu_n = \sum_{j=1}^n \mathfrak{B}_j^n \frac{\lambda^j}{j!}$ and hence

$$\mathbf{E}[(Y_t)^n] = \sum_{j=1}^n \mathfrak{B}_j^n \frac{(t\lambda)^j}{j!}. \text{ As } \mu_1 = \lambda, \mu_2 = \lambda + \lambda^2, \mu_3 = \lambda + 3\lambda^2 + \lambda^3, \dots$$

so $\mathbf{E}[(Y_t)] = t\lambda$, $\mathbf{E}[(Y_t)^2] = \lambda t + (\lambda t)^2, \dots$ For t of the form $\frac{1}{k}$ one has, for example, $\mathbf{E}[Y_{\frac{1}{2}}] = \frac{1}{2}\mu_1$, $\mathbf{E}[(Y_{\frac{1}{2}})^2] = \frac{1}{2}\mu_2 - \frac{1}{4}(\mu_1)^2$, $\mathbf{E}[(Y_{\frac{1}{2}})^3] = \frac{1}{2}\mu_3 - \frac{3}{4}\mu_2\mu_1 + \frac{3}{8}(\mu_1)^3, \dots$. $\mathbf{E}[Y_{\frac{1}{3}}] = \frac{1}{3}\mu_1$, $\mathbf{E}[(Y_{\frac{1}{3}})^2] = \frac{1}{3}\mu_2 - \frac{2}{9}(\mu_1)^2$, $\mathbf{E}[(Y_{\frac{1}{3}})^3] = \frac{1}{3}\mu_3 - \frac{3}{4}\mu_2\mu_1 + \frac{20}{27}(\mu_1)^3, \dots$, which agree with the corresponding combinatorial expressions for the Maxwell-Boltzmann- $\mu_n^{\circ \frac{1}{k}}$ and these could be used to construct the expectations for Y_t with $t \in \mathbf{Q}$

2.2 A continuum of cells

Since μ is *a fortiori* not stable it is not possible to embed μ in any of these convolution semigroups or to interpret this as an arrangement of objects in a continuum of cells (say in a lattice with spacing decreasing to zero). For a chain $(X_i)_{i=1,\dots,k}$ of random variables $\mathbf{E}[(\sum_{i=1}^k X_i)^n]$ is well-defined. When the X_i are i.i.d. we have linked it to arrangements of n elements in k cells. A limiting continuum of cells would be in the form $\mathbf{E}[(\sum_{s \in [0,t]} X_s)^n]$ but this can have a meaning only if at most a finite number of X_s are non-zero. However by taking X to be a random measure or random distribution the continuum of cells can have a meaning.

Definition 2.6. *A random measure is taken to be a mapping associating a real random variable X_A to each element A of a family of Borel sets in $\mathbf{R}_+$, or associating a real random variable $X(\phi)$ to test functions ϕ which are Borel on $\mathbf{R}_+$. A random (Schwartz) distribution associates random variables to test functions θ which are infinitely differentiable with compact support.*

Following [8], a random measure X is said to be weakly decomposable if, for every sequence of disjoint Borel subsets $A_1, A_2, \dots$, the X_{A_i} are mutually independent and $\sum X_{A_i}$ converges almost everywhere to $X_{\bigcup A_n}$. The distribution of a weakly decomposable X is interpreted as the continuous product of the distributions of its components. It follows from [8] Theorem 2.1 that for a weakly decomposable X each X_A is infinitely divisible

and $\sum_{\tau \in (s,t)} X_{\{\tau\}} = X_{(s,t)}$.

If $X_{\{t\}}$ is zero for each t then the characteristic functional is of the classical Lévy-Khinchin form.

A function f is called decomposable if for every finite partition $A_1, \dots, A_n$ of $[0, 1]$ into measurable sets f may be written as $f_1 + \dots + f_n$, where each f_j is measurable with respect to the field of measurable sets generated by the A_j . The conjecture in [8] that, for the σ -field of Borel sets in $[0, 1]$, there are enough decomposable functions to generate all measurable functions was verified in [26] by showing that $t \mapsto X_{[0,t]}$ is a Lévy process. The characteristic functional factors into a product of independent Gaussian parts of various dimensions and a Poissonian part (see [8] Theorem 4.1).

What kind of processes, denoted say by $Y(t)$, can be constructed from random measures and distributions? One such process is $t \mapsto Y(t) = X_{[0,t]}$ as above. For random distributions, if $t \mapsto M(t, \theta)$ is integrable with respect to t and $\theta \mapsto e^{\int_0^t M(s, \theta_s) ds}$ is positive definite (to ensure that it is the Fourier transform of a Schwartz distribution) then $e^{\int_0^t M(s, \theta_s) ds}$ is the characteristic function of $\sum_{s \in [0,t]} X(\{\theta_s\})$. A (Gaussian) white noise corresponds to the characteristic functional with $M(t, \theta) = -\frac{1}{2}\theta^2$. Also a Poisson-type continuous product can be constructed based on a Fermi-Dirac system (cf.[24]).

These above are *Fock*, also called *linearisable*, continuous products. The more interesting non-linearisable continuous products have been investigated in [26] using partitions other than the Borel σ -fields.

Moments. To get moments of the continuous product we could compute $\mathbf{E}[(X_t)^n | X_s]$ or $\mathbf{E}[(X_t)^n X_s(\phi)]$ where say $X(\phi) = \sum_{k=0}^m a_k X^k$ or $X(\phi) = e^{izX}$. In the latter case for $t \in [0, s]$ we may write $\mathbf{E}[(X_t)^n e^{izX_1}] = \mathbf{E}[(X_t)^n e^{izX_s}] \mathbf{E}[e^{iz(X_s - X_t)}]$. When $\mathbf{E}[e^{izX_s}]$ is of the form $e^{s\psi(z)}$ one can calculate the moments by differentiation of the characteristic functional. However we already know by Theorem 2.5 that when Y_t constructed from X is a Lévy process the moments $\mathbf{E}[(Y_t)^n | Y_1]$ are multinomial.

3 Non-classical convolution measure semigroups

3.1 The generalized convolution

A generalised convolution introduced by K.Urbanik, is a binary operation, indicated here by $\cdot$, on non-negative probability distributions, associative commutative and distributive for convex sums. The translation mapping by $x \in \mathbf{R}_+$ is denoted by T_x . It is assumed also that there exists a sequence of real numbers c_n such that $T_{c_n} \delta_1^n$ converges weakly to a measure $\sigma_\kappa \neq \delta_0$, called the *characteristic measure*. Several examples are given in [27].

The convolution is called regular if it admits a (generalised) characteristic function such that there is a bijective correspondence between probability measures and characteristic functions. The translation mapping by $x \in \mathbf{R}_+$ is denoted by T_x . It is postulated that there exists a sequence of real numbers c_n such that $T_{c_n} \delta_1^n$ converges weakly to a

characteristic measure $\sigma_\kappa \neq \delta_0$. The characteristic function of σ_κ is $\int_0^{+\infty} \exp^{-t^\kappa x} d\sigma_\kappa(x)$ where κ is called the *characteristic index*. The semigroups defined by the generalised convolutions correspond to those for $\cdot$ -Lévy processes as described in [25].

For the classical convolution $\sigma_\kappa = \delta_0$ and $\kappa = 1$ and the characteristic function is the Laplace transform of the measure.

Proposition 3.1. *No generalised convolution, other than the classical convolution, is multinomial.*

Proof. For $\kappa = 1$ and $k > n$, $\mu_n^k = \sum_{r=1}^n (-1)^{n+r} C_r^k C_{n-r}^{k-r-1} (\mu_n^r)$, as in [28]. This is compatible with the multinomial combination. For $\kappa \neq 1$ the expansion is incompatible with the multinomial expansion. $\square$

3.2 Non-commutative systems

A non-commutative probability theory can be constructed as a non-commutative algebra $\mathcal{A}$ of observables with a normalised positive linear state, say ϕ ; when $\mathcal{A}$ is commutative to $x \in \mathcal{A}$ there corresponds a measure μ_x such that $\mu_x(\phi) = \phi(x)$. Bose-Einstein and Fermi-Dirac statistics relate to non-commutative quantum systems. Combinatorial convolution semigroups of measures derived from quantum 'random variables' relate to consideration of operators on Fock spaces. Eliminating the (Hamiltonian-based) dynamics and fixing the number of particles, so ignoring creation and annihilation, one obtains a commutative subalgebra of $\mathcal{A}$ generated by the number-operators. For Bose-Einstein and Fermi-Dirac systems the cells correspond to energy levels, 'balls' are indistinguishable and only distinguishable arrangements are considered so $(n; n_1, \dots, n_q) = 1$. For Bosons there will be C_n^{k+n-1} states. For Fermi-Dirac statistics, by Pauli's exclusion principle, a cell will be either empty or contain one ball; there are less balls than cells so there will be C_n^k states; in the computation of $(\sum_{i=1}^k X_i)^n$ one postulates $X_i X_j = -X_j X_i$ for $i \neq j$. Convolutions of Bose-Einstein and Fermi-Dirac random variables have been constructed in [29] by consideration of graded vector spaces and bi-algebras. The Fermi-Dirac convolution can represent a one-dimensional spin $\frac{1}{2}$ Heisenberg ferromagnet (the ferro-magnetism as proposed by Heisenberg) sitting in a Fock space, whereas the Bose-Einstein model has integer spin. Quasi-particles, called magnons, carry the magnetic domain field in this model.

Remark 3.2. *Seeing that a continuum ferromagnet does not exist (see [6] and [24]) there is no chance that the Fermi-Dirac convolution product $\mu^{\circ n}$ can be extended to a $\mu^{\circ t}$ as we do for Maxwell-Boltzmann statistics.*

3.3 The Boolean convolution

The Boolean convolution product, related to a non-commutative probability theory, is denoted by $\uplus$ has been dealt with in [22]. A measure μ can be identified, by its moment sequence, with a (normalised positive linear) states on $\mathbf{C} \langle X \rangle$ and $\mu \uplus \nu$ is identified with states on $\mathbf{C} \langle X_1, X_2 \rangle$, where $\mathbf{C} \langle X_1, X_2, \dots, X_n \rangle$ denotes the ring, with complex coefficients, of polynomials in noncommuting indeterminates $X_1, X_2, \dots, X_n$. The restriction in [22] that μ has compact support is unnecessary and the results are valid under the condition that all moments exist (but then a moment sequence need not be determining).

In [4] the Boolean convolution semigroup $\mathbf{R}_+ \ni t \mapsto \mu^{\uplus t}$ was shown to exist. The semigroup is not the same as the classical convolution semigroup; the characteristic function of μ is a 'self-energy' based on the non-linear Cauchy transform. It can be expressed as $a + \int_{\mathbf{R}_+} \frac{1+xz}{z-x} d\tau(z)$ for $a \in \mathbf{R}$ and some measure τ on $\mathbf{R}$, this form being conducive to defining infinite divisibility of arbitrary distributions. Indeed it is shown in [22] that all μ , as above, are 'infinitely divisible'.

The Boolean convolution is related to a lattice of *non-crossing* partitions; these are used also in quantum-type convolutions (cf. §2),

Proposition 3.3. *The Boolean convolution is not a bilinear relation; indeed it is highly non-linear and it is not one of Urbanik's generalised convolutions. The Boolean convolution is binomial but not multinomial. However the moments of the $\mu^{\uplus k}$ satisfy multinomial decompositions and $\mu_n^{\uplus k} = \mu_n^k$ for $n, k \in \mathbf{N}$.*

Proof. It not distributive for convex sums; for example, $\frac{1}{2}(\delta_a \uplus \frac{1}{2}\delta_b) \uplus \delta_c$ is a convex sum of $\delta_{a+b+c \pm \frac{1}{2}\sqrt{(a-b)^2+c^2}}$ (see [22] Example 3). For $n > 2$ the measure $\mu^{\uplus t}$ does not have the same n 'th moments as any element of μ^{ot} . For example, for random variables X, Y, Z one has

$$(\mu \uplus \nu)(XYX) = \mu(X)\nu(Y)\mu(X) \text{ so}$$

$$(\mu \uplus \nu)_3 = m_3 + 2m_2n_1 + 2n_2m_1 + (m_1)^2n_1 + (n_1)^2m_1 + n_3$$

as opposed to the classical $(\mu * \nu)_3 = m_3 + 3m_2n_1 + 3m_1n_2 + n_3$. The remainder of the Proposition follows as the $\mu^{\uplus k}, k \in \mathbf{N}$, are mutually commutative. $\square$

4 Log-convex sequences, Stieltjes moment sequences and total positivity

Definition 4.1. *Sequences (a_n) of positive reals such that the $\frac{a_n^2}{a_{n-1}a_{n+1}}$ is ≤ 1 , or ≥ 1 , are called log-convex, or log-concave, respectively. We shall call $\frac{a_n^2}{a_{n-1}a_{n+1}}$ a moment ratio and denote it by θ_n . We shall call the sequence θ -log-convex if $\theta_n \leq \theta$ for all n . We call a θ -log-convex sequence strictly log-convex when $\theta < 1$. We similarly index log-concave sequences.*

We may assume, without loss of generality, that $a_0 = 1$. The sequences of moment ratios were used by T.J.Stieltjes in [23] Chapter II.

Remark 4.2. a). *It is shown in Theorem 51.3 of [20], using Katti's test 1.7, that a probability measure on $\mathbf{N}$ is infinitely divisible if (p_n) is log-convex.*

b). *Log-convex and log-concave sequences are known to be unimodal in the sense that they are initially decreasing (increasing) with n until one or two nodes n_0 and $n_0 + 1$ and then increasing (decreasing) with n .*

For $(a_n), (b_n)$ log-convex and log-concave with moment ratios less and greater than θ_1, θ_2 respectively, the sequence (a_nb_n) will be log-convex if $\theta_1\theta_2 \leq 1$.

The binomial sequences and the sequences $(\mathfrak{S}_k^n)_k$ of Stirling subset numbers are well-known to be log-concave.

Proposition 4.3. *Stieltjes moment sequences are log-convex.*

Proof. It is obvious that μ_n is monotone non-decreasing. Since, as shown in [12], $\frac{\mu_{n+1}}{\mu_n}$ is monotone non-increasing, $\theta_n = \frac{\mu_n}{\mu_{n-1}} / \frac{\mu_{n+1}}{\mu_n} \leq 1$. $\square$

The following proposition for log-convexity can be adapted also to log-concave sequences.

Proposition 4.4. *Suppose the sequence (a_n) of positive real numbers has $\theta_n \leq \theta \leq 1$ for all n . Denote $\log a_n$ by f_n .*

a) When $\theta < 1$ one can extend the sequence (f_n) to a smooth continuous convex function F on the relevant interval of $\mathbf{R}_+$ with $F'' \geq \log \sqrt{\frac{1}{\theta}}$,

$F(t) \geq e^{t^2 \log \sqrt{\frac{1}{\theta}}} + O(t)$ and so $a_n > e^{n^2 \log \frac{1}{\sqrt{\theta}}}$. Here $F'(t)$ diverges as $t \rightarrow \infty$.

b) When $\sup \theta_n = 1$ the extension of the f_n to F is such that $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} F'(t) = \rho < \infty$; $F(t)$ is asymptotically linear so a_n is asymptotically the order of $e^{\rho n}$.

Proof. We construct F by fitting parabolas touching tangents, determined by chords, at the points $(n, f(n))$. The 'acceleration' of F at n is $\frac{1}{2}(\log a_{n+1} + \log a_{n-1} - 2 \log a_n) \geq -\log \sqrt{\theta}$. $\square$

Remark 4.5. *Case (b) cannot occur for Stieltjes moment sequences unless the moment sequence is determinate. If the characteristic function is analytic then $\lim_n \sup \frac{a_n^2}{a_{n-1}a_{n+1}} = 1$; there is large class of such μ having $\lim_n \frac{a_n^2}{a_{n-1}a_{n+1}} = 1$ but this does not hold in general (see [12]).*

Corollary 4.6. *If (a_n) is strictly log-convex then for $k < n$ one has $\frac{a_k a_{n-k}}{a_n} < 1$. If (a_n) is θ -log-convex then for $k < n$ one has $\frac{a_k a_{n-k}}{a_n} \leq \theta^{k(n-k)}$.*

Proof. From the concavity of F the gradient of F is non-decreasing as n increases. Considering f_0, f_k, f_{n-k}, f_n the first part of the Corollary follows. The second inequality holds because the sequence $(\theta^{\frac{n^2}{2}} a_n)$ will be log-convex. $\square$

Proposition 4.7. *Fixing n , the sequence $(\mathfrak{B}_k^n)_k$ is log-concave and $k \mapsto \mathfrak{B}_k^n$ can be extended to a continuous convex function on $(0, n)$.*

Proof. If $j < n - 1$, then by [16], $\frac{(\mathfrak{S}_j^n)^2}{\mathfrak{S}_{j-1}^n \mathfrak{S}_{j+1}^n} \geq \frac{j}{j-1} \frac{n-j+1}{n-j}$ so

$\frac{(\mathfrak{B}_j^n)^2}{\mathfrak{B}_{j-1}^n \mathfrak{B}_{j+1}^n} \geq \frac{j^2}{j^2-1} \frac{n-j+1}{n-j} > 1$. The second part of the Proposition follows from Proposition 4.4 $\square$

We note that the $\frac{(\mathfrak{B}_j^n)^2}{\mathfrak{B}_{j-1}^n \mathfrak{B}_{j+1}^n}$ will be close to 1 except for small values of n so the sequences $\mathfrak{B}_j^n \prod_{i=1}^j \mu_{n_i}$ will almost always be log-convex.

Definition 4.8. *A sequence (a_i) is called positive-definite if $\sum_{i,j=0}^n c_i c_j a_{i+j} \geq 0$ for any n and any sequence of non-zero (c_i) , strictly positive-definite when the sum is greater than 0, semi-definite if the sum can be zero.*

The Hankel matrix $[a_0 \cdots a_{2n}]$ is defined as the $(n+1) \times (n+1)$ matrix having leading term a_0 and $a_{i,j} = a_{i+j}$ for all $i, j \leq n$. Its determinant will be written as Δ_n when it is clear what sequence is involved. The determinant of the Hankel matrix $[a_p, \cdots, a_{p+2n}]$ will be denoted likewise by $\Delta_{n,p}$.

A necessary and sufficient condition, going back to Stieltjes [23], that a sequence (a_n) , $a_n > 0$ be a Stieltjes moment sequence is that both $n \mapsto a_{2n}$ and $n \mapsto a_{2n+1}$ are positive-definite functions for all n , and so also if and only if both $[a_0, \dots, a_{2n}]$ and $[a_1, \dots, a_{2n+1}]$ are positive definite for all n .

Definition 4.9. Let M be a square matrix with coefficients say $M_{i,j}$. Let $\alpha = (\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_k)$, $\beta = (\beta_1, \dots, \beta_k)$ where the α and β are made up of non-decreasing sequences of integers. Denote by $M[\alpha|\beta]$ the minor obtained using rows and columns numbered α and β respectively. When α and β are made up of consecutive integers we call $M[\alpha|\beta]$ a Fekete minor. The matrix is called positive-definite if $\sum_{i,j} c_i c_j M_{i,j} \geq 0$ or equivalently if all the principal minors are non-negative. It is called totally positive if every minor is non-negative. We shall use the term strictly totally positive if the above minors are positive, and totally semi-definite if any of the minors are null.

Theorem 4.10. M. Fekete [7] Satz II. A necessary and sufficient condition for a matrix be strictly totally positive is that all Fekete minors are strictly positive.

Theorem 4.11. Let (a_n) be a sequence of positive reals. When (a_n) is a Stieltjes moment sequence then its associated Hankel matrix is totally positive. If all the Hankel matrices $[a_p, \dots, a_{p+2m}]$ are totally positive then (a_n) is an indeterminate Stieltjes moment sequence.

Proof. By definition, a totally positive matrix is also positive-definite. For (a_n) a Stieltjes moment sequence both $n \rightarrow a_{2n}$ and $n \rightarrow a_{2n+1}$ are positive-definite. Any Fekete minor with leading term a_{2m} can be identified with a principal minor by considering the sequence $n \rightarrow a_{2n}$ with leading term a_{2m} and any Fekete minor with leading term a_{2m+1} with a principal minor for the sequence $n \rightarrow a_{2n+1}$. Similarly mapping from principal minors for either $n \rightarrow a_{2n}$ or $n \rightarrow a_{2n+1}$ one can map to all the Fekete minors. Therefore the Hankel matrix will be totally positive by Fekete's theorem. $\square$

Theorem 4.12. a). A Stieltjes moment sequence is indeterminate if and only if both $n \mapsto a_n$ and $n \mapsto a_{n+1}$ are strictly positive definite [10] (cf. Theorem 2.18 of [21]).

b). A Stieltjes moment sequence is indeterminate if and only if both the sequences $(\frac{\Delta_n}{\Delta_{2,n-1}})$ and $(\frac{\Delta_{1,n}}{\Delta_{3,n-1}})$ have non-zero limits as $n \rightarrow \infty$ [11] (cf. [18] Lemma 3).

c). Let (μ_n) be a Stieltjes moment sequence. Consider the 2-dimensional section $D_m = \{(x, y) : (x, y, \mu_2, \dots, \mu_{2m})\}$ of the cone in $(2n+1)$ -dimensional space formed by vectors $(\mu_0, \dots, \mu_{2m})$. Let $c_{1,m}$ be such that $\Delta_{1,2m}$ vanishes if one replaces μ_1 by $c_{1,m}$. The sequence $(c_{1,m})$ is non-decreasing, bounded by μ_1 and we denote $\lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} c_{1,m}$ by c_1 . When $c_1 = \mu_1$ the sequence is determinate. By [18] Theorem 2, the sequence is indeterminate if and only if $\mu_1 > c_1$ and $(c_1, \mu_1] \subset D$ where $D = \bigcap_m D_m$ denotes the limit parabolic region as defined there.

Proposition 4.13. A measure on $\mathbf{R}_+$ with moment generating function convergent in some neighbourhood of the origin is Stieltjes determinate. However a Stieltjes moment sequence may determine a measure which has no well-defined moment generating function.

Proof. The first part is obvious since the generating function will define the measure uniquely. Distribution functions f with determining Stieltjes moment sequences but no

well-defined moment generating function are easily found using G.H.Hardy's (1917, well before the Carleman) criterion for determinacy viz., for some $q \geq 1$ and $\delta > 0$ one has $\int_0^\infty f(u)^q e^{\delta\sqrt{u}} du < \infty$ (see. [21] I §6). For example, this holds whenever $f(u)$ is of the form Ce^{-u^α} , $u > 0$, $\frac{1}{2} \leq \alpha < 1$, noting that here the Hardy integrals are Laplace transforms. There is no moment generating function since $\int_0^\infty e^{su} e^{-u^\alpha} du = \infty$. $\square$

Hardy's criterion can also be adapted for discrete distributions. Other suitable moment sequences could be constructed, using Theorem 4.12(c) and manipulating Stieltjes' Hankel matrices.

Remark 4.14. a). *The critical index δ does not provide a necessary condition for a log-conves sequence to be Stieltjes or for a Stieltjes moment sequence to be indeterminate. Lognormal distributions, as in §1, do not satisfy the δ -condition if $\sigma^2 \geq \log \frac{1}{\sqrt{\delta}} > \log 2$ but are indeterminate no matter how large the moment ratio.*

b). *By Proposition 4.3 a moment sequence is always log-convex. The advantage of log-convexity is that one needs to compute the strict positivity or semi-definiteness of only one of the shifted sequences.*

c). *The authors of [5], studying total-positivity for matrices, not necessarily Hankel, get a slightly smaller value for δ . They do not use a general sufficiency condition but compute inequalities using selected critical minors and relating the critical index to a rate of decrease of minors away from the diagonal.*

d). *Can the critical moment ratio be shown to be $\frac{1}{4}$?*

Corollary 4.15. *The indeterminacy of a Stieltjes moment sequence depends only the asymptotic values of θ_n as $n \rightarrow \infty$.*

Proof. When one knows that the sequence is a moment sequence, for indeterminacy by part (a) or part (b) one need consider only the asymptototic values of the θ_n as $n \rightarrow \infty$. $\square$

See Proposition 1.5 regarding our use of this Corollary.

Remark 4.16. *The moments of lognormal distributions, described in §1, form totally positive Hankel matrices. Indeed the matrices are easily seen to have generalised Vandermonde determinants, well-known to be totally positive.*

Corollary 4.17. *If (a_n) is positive semi-definite every partial sum*

$\sum_{i,j} c_i c_j a_{i+j}$ for $i, j \leq n$ can be positive for any fixed n .

Remark 4.18. *Sufficient conditions for positive definiteness of a matrix involving the off-diagonal $M[(i, j)|(i, j)]$ being small enough are known. For instance, it is not hard to prove that if $\sum_{i \neq j} \sqrt{M[(i, j)|(i, j)]} \leq 1$ then the matrix is positive definite. This relates to the decrease of off-diagonal minors used in [5]. In the case of Hankel matrices it is simpler to depend on having a fast enough rate of increase of the μ_n .*

As in [3] a sequence of positive elements is a Stieltjes moment sequence if the growth rate of the a_n is fast enough. Indeed the growth rate

$a_{n+1} \geq ((n+1)!a_n)^{n+1}$ suggested there is fast enough for the sequence to be indeterminate. It is essentially sufficient that the $\frac{a_{n+1}}{a_n} \geq (\frac{1}{\delta})^n$.

The Maxwell-Boltzmann convolution semigroup.

It will henceforth be sufficient to restrict t to be in $(0, 1)$. The phenomena evident in the expansions of μ_n^t , illustrated in §2 for Poisson μ , persist for the Maxwell-Boltzmann μ_n^{ot} for a general μ and for this we will be referring below to the the alternative expansion in §2

Lemma 4.19. *Being unimodal (see Remark 4.2) the sequence $(\mathfrak{B}_k^n)$, for fixed n , is at first increasing and eventually decreasing. It is known (see [13]), that*

$\frac{\mathfrak{S}_{k+1}^n}{\mathfrak{S}_k^n} = (\frac{k+1}{k})^n \frac{1}{k+1} \left\{ \frac{1-(k+1)(\frac{k}{k+1})^n + \dots}{1-k(\frac{k-1}{k})^n + \dots} \right\} \leq (\frac{k+1}{k})^n \frac{1}{k+1}$; it follows that $\frac{\mathfrak{B}_{k+1}^n}{\mathfrak{B}_k^n} \leq (\frac{k+1}{k})^n \frac{1}{(k+1)^2}$. For k fixed, $\mathfrak{S}_k^n$ is asymptotically $\frac{k^n}{k!}$ so $\mathfrak{B}_k^n$ is asymptotically k^n . In particular, $2^{n-1} - 1 \leq \mathfrak{S}_2^n \leq 2^{n-1}$ so $2^n - 2 \leq \mathfrak{B}_2^n \leq 2^n$ for all n .

Expanding the series,

$$\mu_n^{\text{ot}} = t\mu_n + \frac{t(t-1)}{2} \frac{1}{2^{n-2}} \mathfrak{B}_2^n (C_1^n \mu_{n-1} \mu_1 + C_2^n \mu_{n-2} \mu_2 + \dots + C_{n-1}^n \mu_1 \mu_{n-1}) + C_3^t \mathfrak{B}_3^n (A_3^1 \mu_{n-3} \mu_2 \mu_1 + \dots) + \dots + C_n^t n! (\mu_1)^n.$$

The term accompanying $\mathfrak{B}_2^n$ accounts for when there are $n-2$ empty cells. The coefficients $\frac{1}{2^{n-2}} C_j^n$ are the probabilities of the various arrangements $\mu_{n-j} \mu_j$, $j = 1, 2, \dots, n-1$. The $\mu_{n-1} \mu_1$ is put in the leading position as it will be larger than the other products of moments for a reasonable rate of increase. In the term corresponding to more non-empty cells the probabilities for the products of three moments are more complicated. We have not elaborated on these probabilities, denoted A_k^i , but inequalities between the $\mathfrak{B}_k^n$, analogous to those used in Lemma 2 of [1], can be obtained by using Corollary 4.6 and Lemma 4.19.

Lemma 4.20. *Let (μ_n) be a strictly log-convex Stieltjes moment sequence. For $t \in (0, 1)$ each μ_n^{ot} can be written as a polynomial with leading term $t\mu_n$, subsequent terms alternating in sign, because the terms of C_n^t has alternating signs, and decreasing in modulus. After any term in the sequence the absolute value of sum of the subsequent terms is smaller than the absolute value of the preceeding term.*

Proof. The absolute decrease of the terms is proved using Lemma 2 of [1] with $\epsilon = 1$; Corollary 4.6 gives $\mu_{n-k} \mu_k < \mu_n$ and this can be used to reduce products of k moments to products of $k-1$ moments, and so on. The last part holds generally for alternating series with terms decreasing in modulus. $\square$

Corollary 4.21. *Given a θ -log-convex moment sequence, one has $t\mu_n \geq \mu_n^{\text{ot}} > (1-\theta)t\mu_n$ for all n .*

Proof. By Lemma 4.20 we know that $\mu_n^{\text{ot}} \leq t\mu_n$ and $\mu_n^{\text{ot}} \geq t\mu_n + \frac{t(t-1)}{2} \frac{1}{2^{n-2}} \mathfrak{B}_2^n (\sum_{k=1}^{n-1} C_k^n \mu_{n-k} \mu_k)$. We use $\mathfrak{B}_2^n \geq 2^n - 2$. From Corollary 4.6 we have $\mu_{n-k} \mu_k \leq \theta^{k(n-k)}$ so $\sum_{k=1}^{n-1} C_k^n \mu_{n-k} \mu_k \leq 2\theta\mu_n$. The Corollary follows. $\square$

Proposition 4.22. *For a θ -log-convex Stieltjes moment sequence (μ_n) with small enough θ , or equivalently for a large enough rate of increase in the moments, for any $t \in \mathbf{R}_+$ the Maxwell-Boltzmann (μ_n^{ot}) is a Stieltjes moment sequence.*

Proof. It is sufficient to show that for a large enough rate of increase of the moments one has $\frac{(\mu_n^{\text{ot}})^2}{\mu_{n-1}^{\text{ot}}\mu_{n+1}^{\text{ot}}} \leq \delta$ for all n . We know also that $\mu_{n+1}\mu_{n-1} \geq (\mu_n)^2$, the latter being the leading term in the denominator. After cancelling out the common factor t^2 the leading term, in the denominator, will for fast enough increase of the μ_n dwarf all other terms so the $\frac{(\mu_n^{\text{ot}})^2}{\mu_{n-1}^{\text{ot}}\mu_{n+1}^{\text{ot}}}$ will be small enough to ensure that (μ_n^{ot}) be an (indeterminate) Stieltjes moment sequence.

Furthermore, by Corollary 4.21 $\frac{(\mu_n^{\text{ot}})^2}{\mu_{n-1}^{\text{ot}}\mu_{n+1}^{\text{ot}}} \leq \frac{\theta}{(1-\theta)^2}$. As in [1] it is sufficient that $\frac{\theta}{(1-\theta)^2} \leq \delta$, from which one can calculate the maximal θ that ensures that (μ_n^{ot}) is Stieltjes. $\square$

Conjecture 4.23. *The maximal θ from the proceeding proposition is slightly less than $\frac{1}{6}$. Because, as in Corollary 4.21, the inequality has been obtained using only the first two terms of the expansion of μ_n^{ot} we conjecture that the estimate can be improved by consideration of further terms in the expansion of μ_n^{ot} .*

Acknowledgement

The author wishes to thank Dr.R.Tribe for many helpful conversations and Professor L.Bondesson for suggesting the use of mixed Poisson distributions in Proposition 1.8.

References

- [1] BISGAARD, T. M. Stieltjes moment sequences and positive definite matrix sequences. *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.* 126 (1998), 3227–3237.
- [2] BISGAARD, T. M. AND SASVÁRI, Z. *Math. Nachr.* 186 (1997), 81–99.
- [3] BOAS, R. P. The Stieltjes moment problem for functions of bounded variation. *Bull. Amer. Math. Soc.* 45 (1939), 394–404.
- [4] BOŻEJKO, M. AND WYSOCZANSKI. New examples of convolutions and non-commutative central limit theorems. *Banach centre publications* 43 (1998), 95–103.
- [5] CRAVEN, T. AND CSORDAS, G. Total positivity of a matrix. *J. Lin. Alg. Appl.* 45 (1998), 95–103.
- [6] DUBIN, D. A. AND STREATER, R. F. Nonexistence of the continuum ferromagnet. *Nuovo Cimento B* 50 (1967), 154–157.
- [7] FEKETE, M. Über ein Problem von Laguerre, I. *Rendiconti circ. math. di Palermo* 34 (1912) 89–100.
- [8] FELDMAN, J. Decomposable processes and continuous products of probability spaces. *J. Functional Anal.* 8 (1971), 1–51.

- [9] FELLER, W. *An introduction to probability theory and its applications*, vol.1, 2nd ed., John Wiley and sons, New York, 1965.
- [10] HAMBURGER, H. Über eine Erweiterung des Stieltjes'schen momenten problems, I. *Math. Ann.* 81 (1920), 235-319.
- [11] HAMBURGER, H. Über eine Erweiterung des Stieljes'schen momentum problems, III. *Math. Ann.* 82 (1920), 168-187
- [12] HARKNESS, W.L. AND SHANTARAN, R. Convergence of a sequence of transformations of distribution functions. *Pac.J.Math* 31 (1969). 403-415.
- [13] JORDAN, C. *Calculus of finite differences* 2nd edition, Chelsea N.Y. (1950).
- [14] KATTI, S. K Infinite divisibility of integer-valued random variables. *Ann. Math Stats.* 38 (1967), 1306–1308.
- [15] LEIPNIK, R.B The lognormal distribution and strong non-uniqueness of the moment problem. *Th.Prob.Appl.* 26 (1981) 863-865.
- [16] LIEB, E. Concavity properties and a generating function for Stirling numbers *J.Comb.Th.* 5 (1968) 203-206
- [17] LUKACS, E. *Characteristic functions* 2nd edition, Griffin-London (1970)
- [18] MERKES, E.P. AND WETZEL, M. A geometric characterisation of independant measure sequences. *Pac.J.Math.* 65 (1978) 409-419
- [19] QUENSEL, C.E Studies of the logarithmic normal curve. *Skandinavisk Aktuarietidskrif.* 28 (1945) 142-153.
- [20] SATO, K.-I. *Lévy processes and infinitely divisible distributions*. Cambridge Univ. Press, 1999.
- [21] SHOHAT, J.A. AND TAMARKIN, J.D. *The problem of moments*. Amer.Math.Soc. (1950)
- [22] SPEICHER, R. AND WOROUDI, R. Boolean convolution. *Fields Institute Communications.* 12 (1997), 267–279.
- [23] STIELTJES T.J. Recherches sur les fractions continues I. *Annales de la Faculté des Sciences de Toulouse, (1)* 8 (1894) 1-122.
- [24] STREATER. R,F. AND WULFSOHN, A. Continuous tensor products of Hilbert spaces and generalized random fields. *Nuovo Cimento B* 57 (1968) 330-339.
- [25] THU, NGUYEN VAN Generalized independent increments processes. *Nagoya Math. J.* 133 (1994) 155-175.
- [26] TSIRELSON, B. Noise sensitivity on continuous products:an answer to an old question of J.Feldman. PR/9907011. (1999).

- [27] URBANIK, K. Generalised convolutions. *Studia .Math.* 23 (1964), 217–245,
- [28] URBANIK, K. Moments and generalised convolutions. *Probab. Math. Statist.* 6 (1985), 173–185.
- [29] VON WALDENFELS, W. Springer Lecture Notes in Math. 1064 (1984) 450-465
- [30] WULFSOHN, A Random creation and dispersion of mass. *J. Multivariate Anal.* 18 (1986) 274-286.
- [31] WULFSOHN, A Random measures and related explosion problems. *Stoch.Anal. App* 16 (1998) 1145-1154.